



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,950	07/21/2003	Jason Brown	C02-0109-000	4621
33190 CINGULAR W	7590 08/07/200 /IRELESS LLC	EXAMINER		
5565 GLENRIDGE CONN:, #1725A			TERMANINI, SAMIR	
C/O LINDA G ATLANTA, G	ILES, PATENT MANA A 30342	JER	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·			2178	
		·	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/623,950	BROWN, JASON
Examiner	Art Unit
	Altolik

	Samir Termanini	2178	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 30 July 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL			
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance of FR 1.114. The reply must be filed of	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A</li> </ul>		n the final rejection, which	chever is later. In
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (  MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of appeal. Since a
AMENDMENTS		مطالحمم مسام مسام مسالة	
3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below).	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	ΓE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying the	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		mnliant Amandmant (	DTOL 324\
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpilant Amendment (i	PTOL-324).
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	I sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail: ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> <li>13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	Æ	ul)
		STEPHEN	HONG
	•	" IDERVISORY PAT	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

**Application No. 10/623,950** 

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. In particular, independent claims 21, 27, and 33 only required that the duration is specified before a user is permitted to clear text. This is very different from not permitting a user to clear text for a minimum duration. However, the Amendment raises issues as to whether the adjective prior, still modifies the act of specifying a minimum duration and not the act permitting a user to clear said text. Applicant was advised in the (7/30/2007) telephone interview if the Claims were amended to include a limitation analogous to: not permitting a user to clear text for a specified minimum duration; that further consideration and search would be required.

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant's remarks on page 5 of the 7/30/2007 Amendment state that the examiner "...approved of language proposed by applicant's representatives [and] have incorporated the proposed language exactly as agreed upon during the interview...." However, the Examiner merely indicated that claiming embodiments previously recited in the Applicant's specification, in the manner proposed by Applicant, would not introduce new matter into the application. That is, there would not be an issue of new matter if: the specified duration comprises the duration for which the text is displayed before a user is permitted to clear the text. The Examiner acquiesced in this regard, because support for this limitation was found in the middle of paragraph [0019] on p. 8 of Applicant's specification. Again, Applicant was advised in the (7/30/2007) telephone interview that adding the aforementioned limitations would require further consideration and search..